

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY


CONFIRMATION

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Arthur Loke Bernard Rada & Lee
9 Temasek Boulevard
#23-01 Suntec Tower Two
SINGAPORE 038989

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION
(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference A3-0217 PYK		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 20 APR 2004
International Application No. PCT/SG2003/000177		REPLY DUE within TWO MONTHS from the above date of mailing
International Filing Date (day/month/year) 24 July 2003	Priority Date (day/month/year) 24 July 2003	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Int. Cl. 7 E02D 7/00		
Applicant WONG, Yew Kee et al		

1. This written opinion is the **first** drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The **FINAL DATE** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is:
24 November 2005

4. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

- When?** See the Reply Due date indicated above. However, the Australian Patent Office will not establish the Report before the earlier of (i) a response being filed, or (ii) one month before the **Final Date** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established. The Report will take into account any response (including amendments) filed before the Report is established. If no response is filed by 1 month before the **Final Date**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
- Applicants wishing to have the benefit of a further opinion (if needed) before the report is established should ensure that a response is filed at least 3 months before the **Final Date** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established.
- How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments; according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.
- Also** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

S. GHOSH

Telephone No. (02) 6283 2163

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/SG2003/000177

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed.
- ☐ the description, pages , as originally filed,
pages , filed with the demand,
pages , received on with the letter of
- ☐ the claims, pages , as originally filed,
pages , as amended under Article 19,
pages , filed with the demand,
pages , received on with the letter of
- ☐ the drawings, pages , as originally filed,
pages , filed with the demand,
pages , received on with the letter of
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages , as originally filed
pages , filed with the demand
pages , received on with the letter of

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages
- ☐ the claims, Nos.
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig.

5. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/SG2003/000177

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 4-6, 10, 14	YES
	Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 14	YES
	Claims 1-13, 15-17	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-17	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations

The following documents identified in the International Search Report have been considered for the purposes of this opinion:

D1: GB 2367322	D2: US 4925345	D3: DE 3815748
D4: EP 103283	D5: GB 2358035	D6: GB 2161731

Novelty (N) Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17

Document D1 explicitly discloses all of the features of these claims. See for example page 5 lines 23-31, page 6 lines 7-22, page 7 lines 19-27 and page 8 lines 6-16.

Therefore the subject matter of these claims is not new and does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) of the PCT with regard to novelty.

Inventive Step (IS) Claims 1-13, 15-17

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17 : as above

Claims 4-6, 10 : none of the documents disclose the characterising feature of claim 4, viz., the support frame including at least one opening to facilitate removal of the piling device from around a pile. Documents D2 to D6 also do not disclose the feature of the support frame being mounted on a footing. See for example, column 7 line 32 to column 9 line 13.

However, it is considered that these differences are mere workshop improvements and, as such, do not involve an inventive step. The features added by claims 5, 6 and 10 are typical in devices of this type and therefore they cannot be considered as contributing to patentable ingenuity.

Therefore the subject matter of these claims is obvious and does not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) of the PCT with regard inventive step.

Industrial Applicability (IA)

The invention defined in the claims is considered to meet the requirements of Industrial Applicability under Article 33(4) of the PCT because it can be made by, or used in, industry.